

Off-diagonal hyperfine interaction between the $6p_{1/2}$ and $6p_{3/2}$ levels in ^{133}Cs

W. R. Johnson,* H. C. Ho,[†] and Carol E. Tanner[‡]
Department of Physics, 225 Newland Science Hall
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556

Andrei Derevianko[§]
Department of Physics, University of Nevada, Reno, NV 89557
 (Dated: February 2, 2008)

The off-diagonal hyperfine interaction between the $6p_{1/2}$ and $6p_{3/2}$ states in ^{133}Cs is evaluated in third-order MBPT giving 37.3 Hz and 48.3 Hz, respectively, for second-order energies of the $6p_{3/2}$ $F = 3$ and $F = 4$ levels. This result is a factor of 10 smaller than one obtained from an uncorrelated first-order Dirac-Hartree-Fock calculation and used in the analysis of a recent high-precision (≤ 2 kHz) measurement of the $6p_{3/2}$ hyperfine structure [Gerginov *et al.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 72301 (2003)]. The factor of 10 difference has negligible effect on the conclusions of the recent experiment but will become important for experiments carried out at a precision of better than 1 kHz.

PACS numbers: 21.10.Ky, 27.60.+j, 31.15.Md, 31.25.Jf, 32.10.Fn

I. INTRODUCTION

In the recent study of the hyperfine structure of the $6p_{3/2}$ state of ^{133}Cs by Gerginov *et al.* [1], intervals between hyperfine levels were measured to an accuracy of ≤ 2 kHz, which was sufficient to give, for the first time, a non-zero value for the c hyperfine constant. The value of the nuclear octupole moment of ^{133}Cs obtained from c was $\Omega = 0.82(10)b \times \mu_N$, which is about a factor of 40 larger than nuclear shell-model prediction $\Omega_{\text{n.s.m.}} = 0.022b \times \mu_N$, motivating a re-examination of corrections to the hyperfine constants. One such correction is the second-order hyperfine interaction between the $6p_{3/2}$ and $6p_{1/2}$ states. An estimate of this correction, based on an independent particle model of the cesium atom, was used in [1]. In the present work, we carry out a detailed third-order MBPT calculation and obtain corrections to the $6p_{3/2}$ hyperfine levels that are a factor of 10 smaller than the values used in [1]. Revised values of the hyperfine constants a , b , and c , obtained using the present results for the second-order hyperfine energies agree with those reported in [1] to within the error estimates. However, for future experiments, especially experiments aimed at a precision of better than 1 kHz, it will be important to use the correlated values of the corrections presented here, rather than the larger values given in [1].

II. PERTURBATION EXPANSION

We write the hyperfine interaction in the form

$$H_{\text{hf}} = \sum_{k\lambda} (-1)^\lambda T_{-\lambda}^{(k)} M_\lambda^{(k)},$$

where $T_{-\lambda}^{(k)}$ is an irreducible tensor operator acting in the electron sector and $M_\lambda^{(k)}$ is an irreducible tensor operator acting in the nuclear sector. The first-order hyperfine correction to the energy of a state $|1\rangle$ is

$$W_F^{(1)} = \langle 1 | H_{\text{hf}} | 1 \rangle = \sum_k (-1)^{I+J+F} \left\{ \begin{matrix} J & I & F \\ I & J & k \end{matrix} \right\} \langle J || T^{(k)} || J \rangle \langle I || M^{(k)} || I \rangle.$$

The nuclear matrix elements are given in terms of conventional nuclear moments through

$$\begin{aligned} \langle II | M_0^{(1)} | II \rangle &= \mu \\ \langle II | M_0^{(2)} | II \rangle &= \frac{1}{2}Q \\ \langle II | M_0^{(3)} | II \rangle &= -\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Here, μ is the nuclear magnetic dipole moment, Q is the nuclear electric quadrupole moment, and Ω is the nuclear magnetic octupole moment. With these definitions, we introduce the conventional hyperfine constants a , b , and c through the relations:

$$a = \frac{\mu}{IJ} \langle JJ | T_0^{(1)} | JJ \rangle \quad (1)$$

$$b = 2Q \langle JJ | T_0^{(2)} | JJ \rangle \quad (2)$$

$$c = -\Omega \langle JJ | T_0^{(3)} | JJ \rangle, \quad (3)$$

*Electronic address: johnson@nd.edu; URL: www.nd.edu/~johnson

[†]Electronic address: hho1@nd.edu

[‡]Electronic address: ctanner@nd.edu

[§]Electronic address: andrei@unr.edu;
 URL: <http://www.physics.unr.edu/~tap>

and write the first-order hyperfine energy as

$$W_F^{(1)} = \frac{1}{2} K a + \frac{3K_+ - 4J_+ I_+}{8I(2I-1)J(2J-1)} b + \frac{5K^2(K+4) - 4K[3J_+ I_+ - J_+ - I_+ - 3] - 20J_+ I_+}{I(2I-1)(2I-2)J(2J-1)(2J-2)} c, \quad (4)$$

where $I_+ = I(I+1)$, $J_+ = J(J+1)$, $F_+ = F(F+1)$, $K = F_+ - J_+ - I_+$, and $K_+ = K(K+1)$.

The second-order (in the hyperfine interaction) energy of a state is given by

$$W_F^{(2)} = \sum_{n \neq 1} \frac{\langle 1 | H_{\text{hf}} | n \rangle \langle n | H_{\text{hf}} | 1 \rangle}{E_1 - E_n}.$$

For the state $|1\rangle = |6p_{3/2}\rangle$ of Cs, the second-order hyperfine energy is dominated by the single state $|n\rangle = |2\rangle = |6p_{1/2}\rangle$. Moreover, the largest contribution from this state is the one associated with the magnetic dipole term $k = k' = 1$. After angular reduction, the second-order energy is

$$W_F^{(2)} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} J_2 & I & F \\ I & J_1 & 1 \end{array} \right\}^2 \frac{|\langle J_2 \| T^{(1)} \| J_1 \rangle|^2 |\langle I \| M^{(1)} \| I \rangle|^2}{E_1 - E_2}. \quad (5)$$

Contributions to the second-order energy from the nuclear quadrupole moment have been evaluated in lowest order and found to change the values obtained from Eq. (5) by less than 1%. The fine-structure interval $E_1 - E_2$ in the denominator is determined as the difference between f_{D2} the centroid of the $6s^2 S_{1/2} \rightarrow 6p^2 P_{3/2}$ transition [2, 3] and f_{D1} the centroid of the $6s^2 S_{1/2} \rightarrow 6p^2 P_{1/2}$ transition [4], both of which have been measured to high precision. One obtains $E_1 - E_2 = f_{D2} - f_{D1} = 1.6609669667(11) \times 10^7$ MHz.

III. NUMERICAL ESTIMATES

Correlation corrections to hyperfine matrix elements in alkali-metal atoms are large. Thus, for example, a lowest-order Dirac-Hartree-Fock calculation of the hyperfine constant $a_{3/2}$ for the $6p_{3/2}$ state of Cs (which is proportional to the diagonal matrix element $\langle 3/2 \| T^{(1)} \| 3/2 \rangle$) leads to a result that is a factor of two smaller than the experimental value. One expects (and indeed finds) corrections of a similar size for the off-diagonal matrix element $\langle 1/2 \| T^{(1)} \| 3/2 \rangle$ appearing in the numerator of the expression for the second-order hyperfine energy. If we assume that the relative size of the correlation corrections to the two matrix elements mentioned above are the same, then we can determine the ratio $\langle 1/2 \| T^{(1)} \| 3/2 \rangle / \langle 3/2 \| T^{(1)} \| 3/2 \rangle$ by means of a lowest-order calculation and, using that ratio together with the experimental value of $a_{3/2}$, obtain an accurate value for $\langle 1/2 \| T^{(1)} \| 3/2 \rangle$. That was the strategy used to obtain

TABLE I: MBPT contributions to the hyperfine constants $a_{1/2}$ and $a_{3/2}$ (MHz) of the $6p_{1/2}$ and $6p_{3/2}$ states, respectively, and to the off-diagonal matrix element $gT^{(1)} = g_I \langle 1/2 \| T^{(1)} \| 3/2 \rangle$ (MHz) are presented. The resulting third-order hyperfine constants are compared with experiment.

Term	$a_{1/2}$	$a_{3/2}$	$gT^{(1)}$
1st	160.88	23.92	26.97
2nd	40.66	18.84	-34.15
Bruck	84.40	16.08	-1.12
St Rad	5.43	-7.51	24.85
Norm	-1.20	-0.23	0.04
3rd	88.62	8.33	23.77
Total	290.17	51.09	16.59
Expt.	291.89	50.29	

the values $W_3^{(2)} = 401$ Hz and $W_4^{(2)} = 520$ Hz for the $6p_{3/2}$ state of ^{133}Cs quoted in Ref. [1]. (The ratio of matrix elements was determined in the non-relativistic approximation and did not depend on details of the $6p$ wave function. The non-relativistic approximation is not a serious problem, however, since the ratio obtained using relativistic Dirac-Hartree-Fock wave functions differs from the non-relativistic ratio by less than 5%.)

IV. CORRELATION CORRECTIONS

The estimates made in the previous section depend on the assumption that correlation corrections to reduced matrix elements of the hyperfine operator $\langle j \| T^{(1)} \| j' \rangle$ are independent of the total angular momentum j of the $6p_j$ state. To test that assumption, we carried out correlated third-order MBPT calculations of the three $6p_j$ matrix elements.

In Table I, we give a detailed breakdown of contributions to the third-order matrix elements. Formulas for the first-, second-, and third-order matrix element are given in [5]. We use a modified version of these formulas in which: (a) the sum of the second-order matrix element and the third-order contribution to the random-phase approximation (RPA) is replaced by the exact solution to the RPA equations, and (b) all one-electron matrix elements in third-order are replaced by their RPA counterparts. These modifications give dipole transition matrix elements that are gauge invariant in second- and third-order [6]. The third-order hyperfine constants for the $6p_{1/2}$ and $6p_{3/2}$ states evaluated in this way are within a few percent of experiment. Since we use the same method to evaluate diagonal and off-diagonal matrix elements, we expect the third order off-diagonal matrix element to be accurate to a few percent.

Substituting the third-order off-diagonal matrix element given in Table I into Eq. (5), we find $W_3^{(2)} = 37.3$ Hz and $W_4^{(2)} = 48.3$ Hz for the $6p_{3/2}$ state. Combining the second-order corrections with the observed $6p_{3/2}$

hyperfine intervals (MHz) from [1]

$$W_5 - W_4 = 251.0916(20)$$

$$W_4 - W_3 = 201.2871(11)$$

$$W_3 - W_2 = 151.2247(16),$$

we obtain the following values for the hyperfine constants (MHz)

$$a = 50.28825(23)$$

$$b = -0.4940(17)$$

$$c = 0.00056(7).$$

These values agree within error limits with those found in [1].

Acknowledgments

The work of W.R.J. and H.C.H. was supported in part by National Science Foundation (NSF) Grant No. PHY-01-39928. The work of A.D. is supported in part by NSF Grant No. PHY-00-99419 and in part by a National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) precision measurement grant. The work of C.E.T. is supported in part by NSF Grant No. PHY-99-87984 and in part by the U. S. Department of Energy (DOE) under Grant No. DE-FG02-95ER14579. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of NSF, NIST, or DOE.

-
- [1] V. Gerginov, A. Derevianko, and C. E. Tanner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 072501 (2003).
 - [2] T. Udem, J. Reichert, T. W. Hänsch, and M. Kourogi, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 031801(R) (2000).
 - [3] V. Gerginov, C. E. Tanner, S. Diddams, A. Bartels, and L. Hollberg, Phys. Rev. A **69**, submitted for publication (2004).
 - [4] T. Udem, J. Reichert, R. Holzwarth, and T. W. Hänsch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 3568 (1999).
 - [5] S. A. Blundell, D. S. Guo, W. R. Johnson, and J. Sapirstein, At. Data Nucl. Data Tables **37**, 103 (1987).
 - [6] I. M. Savukov and W. R. Johnson, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 052512 (2000).